DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 310 **EA 011 227**

AUTHOR	Broughton, Diana K.; And Others
TITLE	A Successful Implementation of an Innovation.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Univ., Pullman. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE	Apr 78
NOTE	41p.; Tables 2-4 may be marginally legible
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adoption (Ideas); Differentiated Staffs; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Education; Individualized Instruction; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Success Factors; Tables (Data); *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Hamblen Elementary School WA; *Significant Organizational Change Carried Out

ABSTRACT

After a discussion of the innovation adopted (diagnosis of student learning difficulties, individualized instruction, and differentiated staffing) and its success, the authors examine the reasons for the program's successful maintenance. The objectives of the study were to identify the factors the staff perceived as influential to the maintenance of the project and to determine the three factors that were among the most and the least influential for the continuation of the project. Information was gathered from a questionnaire developed specifically for the study. The three factors considered the most influential were that the principal was enthusiastic throughout the program; that the educational beliefs, values, and attitudes of the total staff were similar; and that the staff thoroughly understood how to use, evaluate, and continually improve the program. The three factors considered the least influential were that the other teachers in the district approved the project, that the innovation had been successfully field tested in other schools, and that the teachers had at least as much training as other teachers in the district. The most significant factor was judged the enthusiasm of the principal. (Author/IRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165310

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark Crouch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EA 011 227

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iv

The Innovative Project at Hamblen School: Significant Organizational Change Carried Out. 1

A Study to Identify Factors that Contributed to the Maintenance of the Hamblen School Project. By Diana Broughton, Mark Crouch and Gary Floyd. 7

Introduction 7

The Survey 7

Statement of the Problem 7

Limitations 8

Method 8

Results 11

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations 19

Summary 19

Conclusions 20

Recommendations 21

References 23

APPENDIX

A. LETTER OF APPROVAL 26

B. DOCUMENTATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS 28

C. QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT 31

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	The Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Made by the Total Hamblen School Staff to the Twenty-two Maintenance Factors	12
2.	The Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Made by the Hamblen School Staff According to Professional Position	14
3.	The Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Made by the Hamblen School Staff According to the Number of Years with the Project	16
4.	The Rank Order of the Most and Least Influential Factors as Perceived by Respondent Groups of the Hamblen School Staff.	18

SIGNIFICANT ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE CARRIED OUT*

Hamblen Elementary School, located in the southeast section of Spokane, implemented an innovative learning project, known as Significant Organizational Change Carried Out (SOCCO), at the start of the 1973-74 school year. Funds for a three-year planning grant were obtained from Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The purpose of the project was to implement a differentiated staffing pattern, diagnose student learning difficulties, and plan individualized instruction for 460 students in grades one through six. Hamblen's instructional program emphasized basic skills and gave students an opportunity to work with teachers competent in specific curriculum areas.

Differentiated staffing provided for the appointment of learning directors who planned, coordinated and diagnosed learning activities within their area of expertise. Learning directors were selected for math, social studies, science, language arts, reading, art, music, physical education and library. Each director was to be a master teacher who was knowledgeable about both discipline and teaching methods and responsible for planning programs.

The learning directors, as managers of learning, had teams of teachers and paraprofessionals to assist them in organizing the content of the discipline, setting instructional goals and determining performance objectives, planning for interdisciplinary approaches, implementing procedures for assessment, prescribing and evaluating for each student, as well as the selection, training and assignment of each staff member, including interns and student teachers. Learning directors coordinated, implemented and

---

*From M. Tully, "Significant Organizational Change Carried Out," Unpublished Report, Spokane, Washington, n.d., 23 pp.

evaluated instructional programs to meet the needs of each student. They were also to interpret and disseminate information concerning the student's progress and educational program.

The differentiated staffing pattern made it possible for teachers to diagnose and plan individualized learning. On the basis of continuous assessment, students were grouped for instruction. Small group work was used for developing skills common to a number of students. Follow-up activities and materials were provided in student team experiences. Individualized learning center activities, planned by learning directors and supervised by a paraprofessional, gave students the opportunity to make choices, to follow directions, and to do independent work. Time was provided for individual conferences in which students and teachers set goals and evaluated progress toward these goals.

The principal, Miss Margaret Tully, was responsible for coordinating and facilitating staff efforts. Learning directors and the principal formed a leadership team to implement the program. Certified teachers carried out the instructional program. There were four paraprofessionals or instructional assistants who helped students under the direction of certified personnel. Instructional assistants were required to hold B.A. degrees, but not necessarily in education. Along with helping students, paraprofessionals provided a link between the community and school.

Other paraprofessionals were clerical assistants who operated equipment and assisted in preparing and using instructional materials. Team aides were paraprofessionals who organized the class physically, distributed materials and supervised non-instructional activities.

Sixty-eight volunteer aides from the community also assisted with the program. Twenty-six aides helped on a regularly scheduled basis. Forty-two were available when needed to help with other activities. The learning

directors supervised them and assigned them to duties such as helping children with specific skill development, operating independent activities in learning centers, and assisting paraprofessionals with typing, organizing and duplicating materials. Teacher trainees were accepted to work with the Hamblen program for one year.

The staff members at Hamblen included the principal, eleven learning directors, three certified instructors, sixteen paraprofessionals, twenty-six volunteer aides and two interns. The pupil-teacher ratio was 36 to 1 but the pupil-adult ratio was 13 to 1. The majority of the faculty was between 50 and 58 years old. To be considered for a position at Hamblen, teachers had to have taught for at least five years and be expert in a curriculum area.

In the SOCOO project, children progressed at their own speed. Learning support centers provided remediation for those needing additional help. The child's speed was determined by his ability to meet the objectives required for his level. After finishing one objective, the child began the next one. If a child did not pass an objective, he was given activities to help him develop skills needed for goal mastery.

Students helped in their own diagnosis and kept records of their own performance. Students were taught a concept and then tested two or three weeks later on what they had learned. Enrichment experiences were given to all children as they moved through a sequence of objectives.

Prior to the opening of school, all first graders were screened for readiness in math and reading. After school started, their progress was evaluated and remediation was available for those requiring it. Although students made continuous progress at their own rate, they were kept on a social level with their peers.

The major objectives for the planning grant were: to increase teachers'

skills in diagnosis of learner's individual needs, to develop viable ways to individualize learning for children, and to coordinate curriculum in a continuous and sequential learning program.

Activities included in the three-year planning grant were:

1. A project manager was selected and employed to coordinate planning procedures.

2. Data files on differentiated staffing, individualized instruction, continuous progress, team teaching and utilization of paraprofessionals were compiled.

3. Criteria were identified to govern the selection of certificated professionals who were to develop the educational program and staffing pattern.

4. Learning directors were selected.

5. An eight-week workshop was held during the summer of 1972.

6. The community was involved and informed as planning progressed.

7. In the summer of 1972, learning directors began to develop goals and objectives for basic instructional areas.

8. During the 1972-73 school year, certificated professionals continued the development of the program and visited other schools. Parents were also involved in plannning the program.

9. The professional staff developed and utilized planned assessment procedures.

10. Learning directors designed the instructional program, developed performance objectives, and developed activities related to the instructional program. They also developed the framework of the staffing pattern to implement the new program.

11. Openings for paraprofessionals were publicized and applications processed.

12. During the summer of 1973, the professional staff trained para-

professionals in an eight-week summer workshop.

After Hamblen began its program in September 1973, an evaluation design was approved. A committee of educators was picked to act as mediators. A traditionally staffed elementary school was compared with Hamblen's program. Achievement and ability tests were given to all students at Hamblen and to two randomly selected classes for each grade level at the control school. Classroom teachers received training in test administration and gave exams under the supervision of the evaluation committee. The hypothesis tested was that children in the Hamblen program would show a gain score comparable to the children in a traditional program.

In both schools students were tested in January, 1974 and post tested a year later in January, 1975. The Stanford Achievement Test was used to determine gain scores. The concomitant or leveling variable was determined by the Lorge Thorndike Intelligence Test and the Cognitive Abilities Test. Raw gain scores on each subtest were compared using an analysis of covariance so that one could compare achievement scores with different ability levels. Overall findings showed that the Hamblen program did not yield substantially different results than those found in a traditional school.

Parental opinion was surveyed in May, 1974 through a questionnaire sent to 326 homes. Forms were completed and returned by 86 percent of the school's parents. A rating of 3.5 was considered positive and all ratings were above that level. Parents were generally positive about the program, with 90% rating the school program either good or excellent. Parents who did rate the program low also rated low on awareness of the project.

The Hamblen program was designed to staff a grade school at no additional cost to the school district. Comparison of costs showed that a traditionally staffed school cost $1,600 more to staff. Hamblen's program utilized differentiated staffing. Fewer certificated teachers were needed than in a

traditional school with the same enrollment.

The SOCCO project was initiated to develop an innovative elementary school program. The plans formulated under the planning grant have been fully adopted as the Hamblen School program.

FACTORS WHICH CONTRIBUTED TO THE MAINTENANCE OF THE HAMBLEN SCHOOL PROJECT

This aspect of the report was derived from a study of SOCCO implementation. A partial review of the literature indicated a bias towards the discussion of factors that lead to the failure of educational innovations. The present authors were interested in identifying factors that lead to the maintenance of innovative programs. A letter was written to Gay Selby, Director of Basic Education of Spokane School District, to obtain permission to do a study at Hamblen School (see Appendix A). In addition, a letter was written to Dr. John Schlotfeldt, Washington State Supervisor of ESEA Title 4-C, Grants Management Section, to obtain his perceptions of factors contributing to the stability of the SOCCO project.

The Survey

Statement of the Problem

The objectives of this study were to: (1) identify the factors that were perceived as influential to the maintenance of the Hamblen School Project, (2), determine the three factors that were among the most influential for the continuation of the Hamblen Program, and (3) determine the three factors that were among the least influential for the continuation of the Hamblen School Program.

The questions to be answered by the study include:

1. What conditions have influenced the continuation of this project?
2. What maintenance factors are consistently identified by the respondents as being among the most and the least influential?

3. In what ways are the perceptions of the Hamblen staff similar with respect to their identification of maintenance factors?

Limitations

The limitations of the study are specified below.

1. The investigation was limited to the perceptions of the Hamblen School staff as they existed in December, 1977.
2. A questionnaire was used in the study. The study is, therefore, limited by the accuracy of the responses.
3. The study was limited by the method of pretesting the survey instrument. In addition, the questionnaire rating scale did not differentiate between a response of "No Opinion" and a response of "Don't Know".
4. The survey was limited by small sample sizes. Referent groups ranged in size from a group with one respondent to a group with thirty-one respondents.
5. The study was limited to the identification of factors associated with the maintenance of the Hamblen Project. Conclusions resulting from this study apply only to the Hamblen project, but the implications may have a more universal use.

Method

Questionnaire Development. A questionnaire was developed specifically for this study. Questionnaire items were formulated from the following sources: (1) the investigators' partial review of related literature identified factors that, according to authorities, contribute to the maintenance of educational innovations (see Appendix B for a list of the questionnaire items keyed to the reference list), and, (2) the investigators visited the Hamblen School on November 8, 1977, to familiarize themselves with the Hamblen program and informally interview several of the staff members. From these two sources the

investigators developed twenty-two questions designed to identify maintenance factors. A three point Likert-type scale was employed in the questionnaire. (see Appendix C).

In addition to the identification of maintenance factors, each participant surveyed was asked to rank in order the three most and the three least influential factors. The selection of the most and least influential factors was made from the initial twenty-two maintenance factors found in Part I of the questionnaire.

A preliminary draft of the questionnaire was reviewed by: Dr. Donald C. Orlich, Professor of Education at Washington State University; and Miss Margaret Tully, principal of the Hamblen School. Comments and suggestions by these persons were considered prior to the final drafting of the questionnaire.

Description of the Population Studied. The population in the study was the Hamblen School faculty as it existed on December 7, 1977. The Hamblen Staff consisted of thirty-one staff members, comprised of one administrator, fifteen learning directors (certificated personnel), thirteen paraprofessionals and two student teachers. Eleven staff members had less than two years with the project (six paraprofessionals and five certificated personnel), six members had more than two but less than four years (two paraprofessionals and four professionals), and fourteen members had more than four years with the project (five paraprofessionals and nine certificated personnel). All thirty-one Hamblen staff members were included in this study.

Collection of Data. On the morning of December 7, 1977, the authors of this study were invited to attend a staff meeting at Hamblen School. During the meeting, time was set aside for the investigators to introduce the Hamblen staff members to the study, solicit their cooperation, and distribute the survey instrument. The participants were instructed to mark their responses

according to whether the maintenance factors listed contributed to the continuation of the Hamblen School Program, and not whether the questionnaire statement was true or false.

There was sufficient time during the staff meeting for the completion of the questionnaires. Twenty-nine completed questionnaires were collected by the investigators at the conclusion of the meeting. Two questionnaires were left at the school, one for a staff member not in attendance and one for Miss Tully. The two questionnaires were returned to the investigators and were included in the tabulation of the data.

Treatment of Data. Analysis of the data in the study was accomplished by using descriptive statistical procedures. The data in Part I of the questionnaire were collated and analyzed by computing frequency distributions and percentages of responses for each of the twenty-two questionnaire items. The questionnaire items were grouped into administrative factors, staff factors, pre-planning factors, factors of approval, or outcome and process factors. The frequencies and percentages of responses were tabulated for the total Hamblen School Staff, for the staff according to professional position, and for the staff according to the number of years with the project. Differences and similarities between the responses of each group were analyzed.

The tabulation of the three most and the three least influential maintenance factors was done by weighting the responses according to their rank order. For example, a questionnaire item received three points if it was identified as the most influential factor, two points if considered the second most influential, and one point as the third most influential. To determine the three least influential factors an item received three points if it was identified as the least influential factor, two points as the second least influential, and one point if it was considered the third least

influential. The questionnaire item with the highest total sum of weighted scores in part two was reported as the most influential maintenance factor and in part three it was reported as the least influential. The tabulation was reported for the total Hamblen Staff, for each professional position, and for "time with the project" categories. Appropriate interpretations were made and discussed.

Results

The frequencies and percentages of responses for each of the twenty-two questionnaire items can be examined in Table 1. Six maintenance factors were identified by ninety to 100 percent of the Hamblen staff as significant in the continued use of the innovation. Item four (the principal has been enthusiastic throughout the program) was identified by 100 percent of the staff. Item six (the principal has been with the project since its beginning) and item seven (Hamblen School parents approve of it) were agreed upon by ninety-seven percent of the respondents. Item eight (Hamblen School parents are receptive to innovations) was important for ninety-three percent of the staff. Item nineteen (evaluation and assessment procedures are strong) and item twenty (a feeling of comraderie has emerged among the staff) were identified by ninety percent of the staff.

The categories of administrative and approval factors each had two questionnaire items that were identified by ninety to 100 percent of the respondents. One (item twenty) of the five staff factors received more than a ninety percent response. Item nineteen (strong evaluation process) was an outcome and process factor that received a ninety percent response.

An additional set of six factors was identified by eighty to ninety percent of the staff. The six factors were: item one (it cost about the same as other District 81 elementary programs), item five (roles and responsibilities

TABLE 1

THE FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES MADE BY THE TOTAL HAMBLEN SCHOOL STAFF* TO THE TWENTY-TWO MAINTENANCE FACTORS

Maintenance Factors by Category	Questionnaire Statements	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
Administrative Factors	1 Similar cost as other district programs	27	87	1	3	3	10
	4 Principal was enthusiastic throughout	31	100	0	0	0	0
	6 Principal remained with the project	30	97	0	0	1	3
Staff Factors	9 Staff is selected by unique process	23	74	4	13	4	13
	10 Similar staff beliefs and values	26	84	3	10	2	6
	11 Trng. equivalent to other Dist. #81 tchrs.	25	81	6	19	0	0
	20 Feeling of comraderie emerged	28	90	3	10	0	0
	22 Staff rewarded with recognition	12	40	11	37	7	23
Pre-planning Factors	13 Innovation successfully tested	0	0	23	74	8	26
	14 Adequate pre-planning time devoted	27	87	0	0	3	13
	15 Studied available literature	19	64	1	3	10	33
	16 Sufficient inservice training provided	23	74	2	7	6	19
	18 Parents were involved in planning	13	42	3	10	15	48
Factors of Approval	2 Other District # 81 teachers approve	2	6	18	58	11	35
	7 Hamblen School parents approve of it	30	97	0	0	1	3
	8 Hamblen parents are receptive to innov.	29	93	2	7	0	0
	17 District administrators approve	17	55	5	16	9	29
Outcome and Process Factors	3 Student achievement is similar	10	33	16	51	5	16
	5 Decision-making process understood	27	87	1	3	3	10
	12 Staff understands how to improve innov.	25	81	4	13	2	6
	19 Strong evaluation process	28	90	0	0	3	10
	21 Daily planning time sufficient	3	10	26	83	2	7

in the decision-making process are understood and performed), item fourteen (adequate time was devoted to pre-planning the project), item ten (educational beliefs, values, and attitudes of the total staff are rather similar), item eleven (the teachers have at least as much training as other teachers in District 81 schools), and item twelve (the staff thoroughly understands how to use, evaluate, and continually improve the innovation). Items one, five, and fourteen were considered important by eighty-seven percent of the staff, while item ten was identified by eighty-four percent. Eighty-one percent of the staff perceived that items eleven and twelve were maintenance factors. Two factors, selection of the staff through a unique process (item nine) and sufficient inservice training (item sixteen) were identified by seventy-four percent of the Hamblen staff.

Two staff factors (items ten and eleven) and two outcome and process factors (items five and twelve) were identified as important by eighty to ninety percent of the respondents. In addition, eighty to ninety percent of the Hamblen staff agreed upon one administrative factor (item one) and one pre-planning factor (item fourteen) as having contributed to the maintenance of the SOCCO project.

Two factors were perceived as not contributing to the maintenance of the Hamblen School project. Sufficiency of planning time (item twenty-one) was seen as insignificant by eighty-three percent of the staff. Successful field testing of the innovation in other schools (item thirteen) was considered unimportant by seventy-four percent. No opinion was expressed by forty-eight percent of the respondents to item eighteen (parents were involved in the planning process).

Table 2 indicates the frequencies and percentages of responses according to professional position to items in Part One of the questionnaire. The influence of items one, four, six, seven, and twenty was agreed to by all

Table 2

THE FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES MADE BY THE
HAMBLEN SCHOOL STAFF ACCORDING TO PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Maintenance Factors by Category	Questionnaire Statements	Tally of Responses												Percentage of Responses									
		Admin. N=1			Learn Dir. N=15			Paraprof. N=13			Stu. Tchr. N=2			Admin. N=1			Learn Dir. N=15			Paraprof. N=13			Stu. Tchr. N=2		
		Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion
Administrative Factors	1 Similar cost as other district programs	1	0	0	15	0	0	11	0	2	0	1	1	100	0	0	100	0	0	85	0	15	0	50	50
	4 Principal was enthusiastic throughout	1	0	0	15	0	0	13	0	0	2	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
	6 Principal remained with the project	1	0	0	15	0	0	12	0	1	2	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	92	0	8	100	0	0
Staff Factors	9 Staff is selected by unique process	1	0	0	12	1	2	8	3	2	2	0	0	100	0	0	80	7	13	62	23	15	100	0	0
	10 Similar staff beliefs and values	1	0	0	14	1	0	10	1	2	1	1	0	100	0	0	93	7	0	77	8	15	50	50	0
	11 Trng. equivalent to other Dist 81 tchrs	1	0	0	12	3	0	10	3	0	2	0	0	100	0	0	80	20	0	77	23	0	100	0	0
	20 Feeling of comraderie emerged	1	0	0	15	0	0	10	0	3	2	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	77	23	0	100	0	0
	22 Staff rewarded with recognition	1	0	0	3	8	3	6	3	4	2	0	0	100	0	0	21	58	21	46	23	31	100	0	0
Pre-planning Factors	13 Innovation successfully tested	0	1	0	0	14	1	0	8	5	0	0	2	0	100	0	0	93	7	0	62	38	0	0	100
	14 Adequate pre-planning time devoted	1	0	0	14	0	1	11	0	2	2	0	0	100	0	0	93	0	7	85	0	15	100	0	0
	15 Studied available literature	1	0	0	9	1	5	7	0	5	2	0	0	100	0	0	60	7	33	58	0	42	100	0	0
	16 Sufficient inservice training provided	1	0	0	11	2	2	9	0	4	2	0	0	100	0	0	74	13	13	69	0	31	100	0	0
	18 Parents were involved in planning	1	0	0	9	0	6	3	3	7	0	0	2	100	0	0	60	0	40	23	23	54	0	0	100
Factors of Approval	2 Other District #81 teachers approve	1	0	0	1	12	2	0	5	8	0	1	1	100	0	0	7	80	13	0	38	62	0	50	50
	7 Hamblen School parents approve of it	1	0	0	15	0	0	12	0	1	2	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	92	0	8	100	0	0
	8 Hamblen parents are receptive to innov.	1	0	0	13	2	0	13	0	0	2	0	0	100	0	0	87	13	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
	17 District administrators approve	1	0	0	7	4	4	9	1	3	0	0	2	100	0	0	46	27	27	69	8	23	0	0	100
Outcome and Process Factors	3 Student achievement is similar	0	1	0	8	5	2	2	8	3	0	2	0	0	100	0	54	33	13	15	62	23	0	100	0
	5 Decision-making process understood	1	0	0	12	0	3	12	1	0	2	0	0	100	0	0	80	0	20	92	8	0	100	0	0
	12 Staff understands how to improve innov.	0	1	0	12	2	1	11	1	1	2	0	0	0	100	0	80	13	7	86	7	7	100	0	0
	19 Strong evaluation process	1	0	0	13	0	2	12	0	1	2	0	0	100	0	0	87	0	13	92	0	8	100	0	0
	21 Daily planning time sufficient	0	1	0	0	15	0	1	10	2	2	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	8	77	15	100	0	0

learning directors, while ninety-two percent agreed to items ten and fourteen. All paraprofessionals considered items four and eight paramount, while ninety-two percent agreed on the importance of items five, six, seven, and nineteen. The two student teachers disagreed with each other on items one, two, and ten. Randomness of response among staff members was displayed for items two, three, fifteen, seventeen, eighteen, and twenty-two.

Of the six items considered most significant by ninety to 100 percent of the total staff, the administration and both student teachers selected all six. Learning directors all agreed on items four, six, seven, and twenty. Two of the fifteen learning directors had varying perceptions on items eight and nineteen. One of the thirteen responses from paraprofessionals differed for item six.

The principal and all learning directors agreed 100 percent that all administrative factors were important. Of the four professional groups, the principal was the only one that felt that all staff factors were important. Student teachers felt that all of them were important except item four. The principal agreed that all factors of approval were important. Student teachers agreed that all outcome and process factors were important except for item three.

Table 3 indicates the frequencies and percentages of responses of staff members according to the number of years with the project. All staff members in each category identified item four (enthusiasm of the principal) as influential. Ninety-one percent of the staff members who had been with the project less than two years identified item five (roles and responsibilities in the decision-making process are understood and performed), item six (the principal has been with the project since the beginning), and item seven (Hamblen School parents approve of it), as important maintenance factors. All staff members who had been with the project more than two but less than four years identified

TABLE 3

THE FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO THE MAINTENANCE FACTORS MADE BY THE HAMBLEN SCHOOL STAFF ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF YEARS WITH THE PROJECT

Maintenance Factors by Category	Questionnaire Statements	Tally of Responses									Percentage of Responses								
		Less than 2 yrs. N=11			More than 2 Less than 4 N=6			More than 4 yrs. N=14			Less than 2 yrs. N=11			More than 2 Less than 4 N=6			More than 4 yrs. N=14		
		Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion
Administrative Factors	1 Similar cost as other district programs	7	1	3	6	0	0	14	0	0	64	9	27	100	0	0	100	0	0
	4 Principal was enthusiastic throughout	11	0	0	6	0	0	14	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
	6 Principal remained with the project	10	0	1	6	0	0	14	0	0	91	0	9	100	0	0	100	0	0
Staff Factors	9 Staff is selected by unique process	7	1	3	4	1	1	12	2	0	64	9	27	66	17	17	86	14	0
	10 Similar staff beliefs and values	8	2	1	5	0	1	13	1	0	73	18	9	83	0	17	93	7	0
	11 Trng. equivalent to other Dist. #81 cchrs.	8	3	0	4	2	0	13	1	0	73	27	0	67	33	0	93	7	0
	20 Feeling of comraderie emerged	9	2	0	5	1	0	14	0	0	82	18	0	83	17	0	100	0	0
	22 Staff rewarded with recognition	6	4	1	1	2	3	5	5	3	55	36	9	17	33	50	39	39	22
Pre-planning Factors	13 Innovation successfully tested	0	5	6	0	5	1	0	13	1	0	45	55	0	83	17	0	93	7
	14 Adequate pre-planning time devoted	9	0	2	5	0	1	14	0	0	83	0	18	83	0	17	100	0	0
	15 Studied available literature	7	0	3	0	0	6	12	1	1	70	0	30	0	0	100	86	7	7
	16 Sufficient inservice training provided	7	1	3	3	0	3	13	1	0	64	9	27	50	0	50	93	7	0
	18 Parents were involved in planning	2	0	9	1	1	4	10	2	2	18	0	82	17	17	66	72	14	14
Factors of Approval	2 Other District #81 teachers approve	0	4	7	0	3	3	2	11	1	0	36	64	0	50	50	14	79	7
	7 Hamblen School parents approve of it	10	0	1	6	0	0	14	0	0	91	0	9	100	0	0	100	0	0
	8 Hamblen parents are receptive to innov.	11	0	0	6	0	0	12	2	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	86	14	0
	17 District administrators approve	2	2	7	5	0	1	10	3	1	18	18	64	83	0	17	72	21	7
Outcome and Process Factors	3 Student achievement is similar	2	6	3	6	0	0	2	10	2	18	55	27	100	0	0	14	72	14
	5 Decision-making process understood	10	0	1	4	1	1	13	0	1	91	0	0	66	17	17	93	0	7
	12 Staff understands how to improve innov.	9	1	1	4	1	1	12	2	0	82	9	9	66	17	17	86	14	0
	19 Strong evaluation process	9	0	2	5	0	1	14	0	0	82	0	18	83	0	17	100	0	0
	21 Daily planning time sufficient	2	8	1	0	6	0	1	12	1	18	73	9	0	100	0	7	86	7

as significant, item one (it cost about the same as other District #81 elementary programs), item three (student achievement is about the same as in any other District #81 elementary programs), in addition to items six, seven, and eight. All staff members who had been with the project more than four years also identified items one, six, and seven. In addition, they identified item fourteen (adequate time was devoted to pre-planning the project), item nineteen (the evaluation and assessment procedures are strong), and item twenty (a feeling of comraderie has emerged among the staff) as influential.

There was unanimous agreement that all administrative factors were important except for those respondents with less than two years experience. No other category of factors had 100 percent agreement or disagreement by the three respondent groups.

The ranking of factors according to staff perceptions of importance is displayed in Table 4. The total Hamblen staff selected item four (the principal has been enthusiastic throughout the program), item ten (educational beliefs, values and attitudes of the total staff are rather similar), and item twelve (the staff thoroughly understands how to use, evaluate, and continually improve the innovation) as the three most influential for the continuation of the program. Item four was ranked as the most influential factor by learning directors, paraprofessionals, staff members having less than two years of experience with the project, and staff members having more than four years of experience with the project. Item ten was selected by all groups except the administration and those staff members who had been with the project more than four years. Item twelve was the third highest ranked factor, but was selected among the top three in order of importance only by student teachers. Items selected by one category of staff members but not by any other category were items seven, five, twelve, and twenty. Item twenty (a feeling of comraderie has emerged among the staff) was selected only by those

TABLE 4

THE MOST AND LEAST INFLUENTIAL FACTORS IN ORDER AS PERCEIVED BY DIFFERENT RESPONDENT GROUPS OF HAMBLEN SCHOOL STAFF

Respondent Groups	Most Influential Factors in Order of Importance			Least Influential Factors in Order of Least Imp.		
	Weighted Total	Ques. No.	Questionnaire Statement	Weighted Total	Ques. No.	Questionnaire Statement
Total Hamblen Staff	49	4	Principal was enthusiastic throughout	55	2	Other District #81 teachers approve
	25	10	Similar staff beliefs and values	34	13	Innovation successfully tested
	15	12	Staff understands how to improve innov.	11	11	Trng. equivalent to other Dist. #81 tchrs.
Administration	3	14	Adequate pre-planning time devoted	3	13	Innovation successfully tested
	2	1	Similar cost as other district programs	2	11	Trng. equivalent to other Dist. #81 tchrs.
	1	7	Hamblen School parents approve of it	1	10	Similar staff beliefs and values
Learning Directors	28	4	Principal was enthusiastic throughout	26	2	Other District #81 teachers approve
	14	10	Similar staff beliefs and values	17	13	Innovation successfully tested
	7	6	Principal remained with the project	10	21	Daily planning time sufficient
Paraprofessionals	20	4	Principal was enthusiastic throughout	22	2	Other District #81 teachers approve
	9	10	Similar staff beliefs and values	14	13	Innovation successfully tested
	7	1	Similar cost as other district programs	6	3	Student achievement is similar
Student Teachers	4	5	Decision-making process understood	5	2	Other District #81 teachers approve
	3	12	Staff understands how to improve innov.	4	1	Similar cost as other district programs
	2	10	Similar staff beliefs and values	3	10	Similar staff beliefs and values
Less than 2 yrs. with Project	15	4	Principal was enthusiastic throughout	22	2	Other District #81 teachers approve
	10	6	Principal remained with the project	9	13	Innovation successfully tested
	9	10	Similar staff beliefs and values	5	10	Similar staff beliefs and values
More than 2 Less than 4 yrs. with Project	10	10	Similar staff beliefs and values	8	13	Innovation successfully tested
	9	4	Principal was enthusiastic throughout	7	2	Other District #81 teachers approve
	5	1	Similar cost as other district programs	6	21	Daily planning time sufficient
More than 4 yrs. with Project	25	4	Principal was enthusiastic throughout	26	2	Other District #81 teachers approve
	8	14	Adequate pre-planning time devoted	17	13	Innovation successfully tested
	7	20	Feeling of comraderie emerged	8	11	Trng. equivalent to other Dist. #81 tchrs.

who had been with the school for more than four years.

The least influential factors were considered by the total staff to be item 2 (District #81 teachers outside the project approve of it), item thirteen (the innovation had been successfully field tested in other schools), and item eleven (the teachers have at least as much training as other teachers in District #81 schools). Item two was selected as the least influential factor by every referent group except the administration and those respondents with between two and four years experience with the project. Item thirteen was selected by all groups except student teachers. Item eleven was ranked among the top three factors by only the administration and teachers who had been with the project more than four years. Item three (student achievement is about the same as in any other District #81 elementary program) was selected only by paraprofessionals. Item one (it cost about the same as other District #81 elementary programs) was selected only by student teachers. Item ten (similar staff values) was ranked by student teachers and those respondents with less than two years with the project as the third most and as the third least influential factor.

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

While reviewing literature on innovations, the authors noted a concentration on failure rather than a focus on success. As a result, the present writers decided to investigate factors that lead to the stability of a personalized learning program at Hamblen Elementary School in Spokane, Washington. The objectives of the study were to identify factors that lead to the maintenance of the program, and to name the three most and three least influential factors as perceived by various persons. At the outset of the study, the authors made several assumptions including the conjecture that the Hamblen

program was indeed stable.

The investigators wrote a questionnaire containing possible factors that lead to the maintenance of innovations. These factors were derived from various sources of literature on implementation of innovations. Once the writers' instructor and the Hamblen principal approved of the instrument, it was distributed to the Hamblen staff. A tabulation of the data followed and various conclusions were formed. During the entire process the authors were aware of numerous limitations of the study.

Conclusions

Assuming the limitations of the study, the present authors concluded that:

1. The factors perceived as influential to the maintenance of the Hamblen School project were:
   a. The principal has been enthusiastic throughout the program.
   b. The principal has been with the program since its beginning.
   c. Hamblen School parents approve of it.
   d. Hamblen School parents are receptive to innovations.
   e. The evaluation and assessment procedures are strong.
   f. A feeling of comraderie has emerged among the staff.
2. The three factors considered the most influential for the continuation of the Hamblen program were:
   a. The principal has been enthusiastic throughout the program.
   b. Educational beliefs, values, and attitudes of the total staff are rather similar.
   c. The staff thoroughly understands how to use, evaluate, and continually improve the innovation.
3. The three factors considered the least influential for the continuation of the Hamblen School program were:

a. District #81 teachers outside the project approve of it.

b. The innovation had been successfully field tested in other schools.

c. The teachers have at least as much training as other teachers in District #81 schools.

4. The enthusiasm of the principal throughout the program was the only factor identified among the most influential and considered significant by the total staff.

Recommendations

From the conclusions, the authors recommend that anyone responsible for the design of innovative educational projects give careful attention to the selection of a project leader. It is important that the selected project leader continually demonstrate enthusiasm for the innovation. In addition, attention needs to be given to the feasibility that the leader selected will remain with the project.

The present researchers recommend that planners of educational innovations give consideration to the citizenry effected by an innovation. Initial planning should include an analysis of the receptive nature of parents who will be impacted. The present writers also recommend that efforts be made by innovators to aggressively seek parental approval of innovations. The receptive nature of parents to innovations along with parental approval are factors that will enhance the probability of an innovation becoming stabilized.

The study revealed that the presence of a strong evaluation procedure and a feeling of comraderie among staff members were factors conducive to the continuation of the Hamblen School Project. Therefore, the present authors recommend that educational innovators design effective means for assessing the progress of an innovation. Innovators should also give consideration to supporting ways of facilitating a feeling of unity among those implementing

the innovation.

The present writers recommend that the central administration of the Spokane Public Schools give special attention to the results of the study. The paramount factor identified by the Hamblen staff has been the perpetual enthusiasm of the principal. A policy of the Spokane School District is to periodically relocate elementary principals. The relationship between the primary conclusion of this study and the District #81 policy of moving elementary principals needs to be examined.

References

1. Alkin, M. C. "Evaluating the Cost-Effectiveness of Instructional Programs." In M. C. Wittrock and D. E. Wiley (Eds.), The Evaluation of Instruction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

2. Aslin, N. C., and DeArman, J. W. "Adoption and Abandonment Practices in High Schools." Educational Leadership, May 1976, pp. 601-666.

3. Atwood, M. S. "Small-Scale Administrative Change: Resistance to the Introduction of a High School Guidance Program." In Matthew B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

4. Barnett, H. G. Innovation, The Basis of Cultural Change. McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1953.

5. Berman, Greenwood, McLaughlin, and Pincus. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. V: Executive Summary. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, April 1975.

6. Berman, P., and McLaughlin, H. W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. 1: A Model of Educational Change. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, Sept. 1974.

7. Berman, P., and Pauly, E. W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. 11: Factors Affecting Change Agent Projects. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, April 1975.

8. Brickell, Henry M. "State Organization for Educational Change: A Case Study and a Proposal." In Matthew B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

9. Charters, W. W., Jr., et. al. The Process of Planned Change in the School's Instructional Organization. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1973.

10. Chesler, Mark A., and Fox, Robert. "Teacher Peer Relations and Educational Change." NEA Journal, 56, No. 5, May 1967.

11. Deal, T.E. "An Organizational Exploration of the Failure of Alternative Secondary Schools." Educational Researcher, April 1975, pp. 10-16.

12. A Foundation Goes to School, New York: The Ford Foundation, 1972.

13. Fullan, Michael, and Pomfret, Alan, "Research in Curriculum and Instructional Implementation." Review of Educational Research, 47:1. Winter 1977, pp. 335-397.

14. Gallagher, A. "Directed Change in Formal Organizations: The School System." In Richard O. Carlson (Ed.), Change Process in the Public Schools. Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965.

15. Glaser, E. M., and Taylor, S. H. Factors Influencing the Success of Applied Research: A Study of Ten NIMH-Funded Projects. Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1969.

16. Greenwood, Mann, and McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change. Santa Monica: Rand Series, April 1975.

17. Havelock, Ronald G. The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

18. Heath, S. P., and Orlich, D. C. "Determining Costs of Educational Technology: An Exploratory Review." Educational Technology, February 1977, pp. 26-33.

19. Hutchins, C. L. Educational Development Case Study: An Elementary Science Information Unit. Berkeley: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research, Jan. 1, 1971.

20. MacKenzie, Gordon N. "Curriculum Change: Participants, Power and Processes." In Matthew B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1964.

21. Miles, Matthew B. Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1964.

22. Morrish, Ivor. Aspects of Educational Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1976.

23. Orlich, D. C., May, F. B., and Harder, R. J. "Change Agents and Instructional Innovations: Report 2." The Elementary School Journal, April 1973, pp. 390-398.

24. Pierce, Wendall H. "Is Innovation a Dirty Word?" In Sanford Temkin and Mary V. Brown (Eds.), What Do Research Findings Say About Getting Innovations into Schools: A Symposium. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, January 1974.

25. Pincus, John. "Incentive for Innovation in the Public Schools." Review of Educational Research, 44 (4).

26. Temkin, Sanford. "A School District Strategy for Interfacing with Educational R and D." In Sanford Temkin and Mary V. Brown (Eds.), What Do Research Findings Say About Getting Innovations into Schools: A Symposium. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, January 1974.

27. Watson, Goodwin. "Resistance to Change." In Goodwin Watson (Ed.), Concepts for Social Change. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, NEA, 1967.

28. Watson, Goodwin, and Glaser, Edward M., "What We Have Learned About Planning for Change." Management Review, November 1965.

29. Woods, Thomas E. The Administration of Educational Innovation. Eugene, Oregon: Educational Research, School of Education, University of Oregon, 1967.

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF APPROVAL

October 13, 1977

Ms. Diana Broughton
Mr. Mark Crouch
Mr. Gary Floyd
Department of Education
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164

Dear Diana, Mark and Gary:

I have discussed your request with Miss Margaret Tully, principal of Hamblen Elementary School, and she has agreed to cooperate with you in your project for Education 515. Please work directly with Miss Tully in the future.

We would very much like to have you share the results of your questionnaire with us when your project is completed. Good luck to you with your project.

Sincerely,

Gay V. Selby, Director
Basic Education Division

GVS/bp

cc: Miss Tully
Dr. Blackburn
Dr. Don Orlich

APPENDIX B

DOCUMENTATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Documentation of Questionnaire Items

	Statement	References
1.	it cost about the same as other District #81 elementary programs.	(1, p. 221) (2, pp. 601-606) (4, Chap. 13) (6, p. 17) (18, p. 26)
2.	District #81 teachers outside the project approve of it.	(11, p. 10) (12, p. 31)
3.	student achievement is about the same as in any other District #81 elementary program.	(11, p. 10)
4.	the principal (Project Manager) has been enthusiastic throughout the program.	(7) (12) (16, p. 66) (23, p. 397)
5.	roles and responsibilities in the decision-making process are understood and performed.	(15) (16, p. 65)
6.	the principal (Project Manager) has been with the project since its beginning.	(12, pp. 33-34)
7.	Hamblen School parents approve of it.	(12, p. 37) (14, p. 43)
8.	Hamblen School parents are receptive to innovations.	(12, p. 41) (21, p. 640) (22, p. 53) (24, p. 118) (29, p. 23)
9.	the staff is selected through a unique process.	(5, p. 11) (12, p. 32) (21, p. 18) (27, pp. 12-22)
10.	educational beliefs, values and attitudes of the total staff are rather similar.	(3, p. 72) (5, p. 15) (12, p. 32) (20, p. 419) (21, p. 17) (22, p. 95) (22, p. 118)
11.	the teachers have at least as much training as other teachers in District #81 schools.	(9, p.311)

	Statement	References
12.	the staff thoroughly understands how to use, evaluate, and continually improve the innovation.	(5, p. 13) (21, p. 650) (21, p. 653) (26, pp. 135-137) (27, p. 23)
13.	the innovation had been successfully field tested in other schools.	(9, p. 83) (21, pp. 20-29) (24, p. 118) (25, p. 134)
14.	adequate time was devoted to pre-planning the the project.	(5, p. 8) (5, p. 13) (13, pp. 373-374) (24, p. 118)
15.	the staff read and studied available literature on the innovation	(5, p. 8) (5, p. 13) (19, p. 5) (25, p. 118) (25, p. 125) (29, pp. 33-41)
16.	sufficient inservice training was provided.	(8, p. 505) (16, p. 65) (17, p. 116) (29, p. 57)
17.	District #81 administrators approve of the Hamblen School Program.	(16, p. 64) (16, p. 66) (17, p. 44)
18.	parents were involved in the planning process.	(12, p. 39) (17, p. 58)
19.	the evaluation and assessment procedures are strong.	(17, p. 135) (28, p. 46)
20.	a feeling of comraderie has emerged among the staff.	(10, p. 26) (16, p. 65)
21.	daily planning and evaluation time is sufficient.	(9, pp. 63-64) (17, pp. 134-135)
22.	the staff is rewarded with recognition for their efforts.	(13, p. 33) (17, p. 134) (29, p. 37)

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT

Position _____

Years with the program _____

A SURVEY TO IDENTIFY FACTORS WHICH LEAD
TO THE MAINTENANCE OF THE HAMBLEN SCHOOL PROGRAM

PART I - INSTRUCTIONS: The following is a list of maintenance factors that may have lead to the continuation of the Hamblen School Program. Please read carefully each factor listed. On the rating scale please check only one of the three responses for each criterion to indicate your opinion of whether the factor was influential in the continuation of the Hamblen School Program.

The Hamblen School Program has continued because:	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion
1. it cost about the same as other District #81 elementary programs.	_____	_____	_____
2. District #81 teachers outside the project approve of it.	_____	_____	_____
3. student achievement is about the same as in any other District #81 elementary programs.	_____	_____	_____
4. the principal (Project Manager) has been enthusiastic throughout the program.	_____	_____	_____
5. roles and responsibilities in the decision-making process are understood and performed.	_____	_____	_____
6. the principal (Project Manager) has been with the project since its beginning.	_____	_____	_____
7. Hamblen School parents approve of it.	_____	_____	_____
8. Hamblen School parents are receptive to innovations.	_____	_____	_____

The Hamblen School Program has continued because:	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion
9. the staff is selected through a unique process.	____	____	____
10. educational beliefs, values and attitudes of the total staff are rather similar.	____	____	____
11. the teachers have at least as much training as other teachers in District #81 schools.	____	____	____
12. the staff thoroughly understands how to use, evaluate, and continually improve the innovation.	____	____	____
13. the innovation had been successfully field tested in other schools.	____	____	____
14. adequate time was devoted to pre-planning the project.	____	____	____
15. the staff read and studied available literature on the innovation.	____	____	____
16. sufficient inservice training was provided.	____	____	____
17. District #81 administrators approve of the Hamblen School Program.	____	____	____
18. parents were involved in the planning process.	____	____	____
19. the evaluation and assessment procedures are strong.	____	____	____
20. a feeling of comraderie has emerged among the staff.	____	____	____

The Hamblen School Program has continued because:	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion
21. daily planning and evaluation time is sufficient.	_____	_____	_____
22. the staff is rewarded with recognition for their efforts.	_____	_____	_____

PART 2 - INSTRUCTIONS: Please re-examine the maintenance factors listed in PART I of the questionnaire. Identify the three factors that you think are among the most influential to the continuation of the Hamblen School Program.

1. The most influential factor is #_____.
2. The second most influential factor is #_____.
3. The third most influential factor is #_____.

PART 3 - INSTRUCTIONS: Please re-examine the factors listed in PART I. Identify the three factors that you think were the least influential in the continuation of the Hamblen School Program.

1. The least influential factor is #_____.
2. The second least influential factor is #_____.
3. The third least influential factor is #_____.